

REMARKS

I. Status Summary

Claims 14-19 and 33-38 are pending in the present application and presently stand rejected. Claims 14, 18, and 33 have been amended by this amendment. Reconsideration of the application as amended and based on the arguments set forth herein is respectfully requested.

Support for the amendments to claims 14, 18, and 33 can be found throughout the application, particularly at page 7, line 23, to page 9, line 18. Thus, the claim amendments do not introduce any new subject matter and are supported by the original written description.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 33-35, 37, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,521,844 to Karis (hereinafter, "Karis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 33, the Action states that Karis teaches a computer system having a graphical user interface including a display and a user input device and a method for displaying statistical measures for selected parameter values produced from analysis of time-tagged data from a mail or paper processing system. The Action also states that Karis teaches, at Figure 14 and column 9, lines 56-62, a step of analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines of different types associated with a mail or paper processing system by state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one

Serial No.: 10/055,604

event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or paper processing system. Further, the Action states that Figure 14 of Karis teaches displaying on a display parameter descriptions for mail or paper processing parameter values produced from the analysis of time-tagged data, and including status information indicating results of comparing the parameter values to reference values. The Action further states that Figure 15 of Karis teaches displaying on the display statistical measures for a selected parameter description produced from the analysis of time-tagged data.

Claims 14, 18, and 33 have been amended by this amendment. It is noted that some of the features added to the claims by the present amendments are contained in the independent claims of the parent application, Application Serial No. 09/434,406, now issued U.S. Patent No. 6,625,567.

Independent claim 33 has been amended to better clarify the present subject matter. More specifically, element (a) of independent claim 33 now recites that analyzing time-tagged data associated with the plurality of machines of different types associated with the mail or paper processing system for producing parameter values of the mail or paper processing system comprises (i) reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items, the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the log file, and (ii) parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to at least one event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or paper

Serial No.: 10/055,604

processing system. In addition to the distinctions noted with respect to Karis in previous amendments, there is no teaching in Karis of analyzing time-tagged data associated with the plurality of machines wherein the analysis comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the log file. Further, there is no teaching in Karis of the analysis comprising parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to at least one event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or paper processing system. Rather, Karis discloses a printing press monitoring system with a number of sensors where the system can monitor, analyze, and advise an operator as to various operations of the printing press. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 33, and dependent claims 34, 35, 37, and 38, based upon Karis should now be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 14-19 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Karis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,661 to Rothschild et al. (hereinafter, "Rothschild"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 14, the Action states that Karis teaches a method comprising analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines of different types associated with a mail or paper processing system as the Action

references Figure 14 of Karis. The Action also states that column 9, lines 56-62, of Karis discloses that the method comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines. Further, the Action states that column 9, lines 56-62, of Karis discloses that the method comprises state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. The Action also states that Karis discloses that the method comprises displaying, on the display, a first window including parameter descriptions for mail or paper processing parameter values produced from the analysis of time-tagged data, and including status information indicating the results of comparing the parameter values to reference values. Further, the Action states that Karis discloses that the method comprises displaying, on the display, a third window including a graph of measured values for the selected parameter description. Finally, the Action states that Karis discloses that the method comprises receiving input from a user for selecting the parameter description. Figure 15 of Karis is noted as a graph that can be selected during the monitor routine as the graph illustrates the tension history obtained for a particular roll from the start of the roll on the press. The Action acknowledges, however, that Karis fails to disclose displaying second window including a table of statistical measures for a selected parameter description produced from analysis of time-tagged data in the first window. The Action states that Karis does already graph such data, but that the display of the data is not in a table format. According to the Action, it is inherent in Karis that this data exists, because a graph from the data is drawn. Rothschild is relied upon though for disclosing a window including a table of

Serial No.: 10/055,604

statistical measures for a selected parameter as Figure 10 of Rothschild is referenced. The Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Karis with the teachings of Rothschild to include a table for the selected parameter with the motivation to provide a user with a more detailed description about that selected parameter.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to better clarify the present subject matter. In particular, element (a) of claim 14 now recites that analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines of different types associated with a mail or paper processing system for producing parameter values of the mail or paper processing system comprises (i) reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items, the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the log file, and (ii) parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. In addition to the distinctions noted with respect to Karis in previous amendments, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines wherein the analysis comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the log file. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple,

Serial No.: 10/055,604

separated data items relating to at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. Rather, Karis discloses a printing press monitoring system with a number of sensors where the system can monitor, analyze, and advise an operator as to various operations of the printing press. The addition of the teaching of Rothschild with the teachings of Karis fails to overcome the significant shortcomings of Karis. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14, and dependent claims 15-17, based upon a combination of Karis and Rothschild should now be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Regarding claim 18, claim the Action states that Karis teaches a method comprising analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines of different types associated with a mail or paper processing system as the Action references Figure 14 of Karis. The Action also states that column 9, lines 56-62, of Karis discloses reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines. Further, the Action states that Karis discloses state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. The Action also states that Karis discloses displaying a first window including parameter descriptions for mail or paper processing values produced from analysis of time-tagged data, and including status information indicating results of comparing the parameter values to reference values. Further, the Action states that Karis discloses displaying a third window including a graph of measured values for the selected parameter description, and in response to receiving the input from the user, displaying a table of statistical measures for the selected parameter description. The Action also

states that Karis discloses displaying a graph of measured values for the selected parameter description. Figure 15 of Karis is noted as a graph that can be selected during the monitor routine as the graph illustrates the tension history obtained for a particular roll from the start of the roll on the press. The Action acknowledges, however, that Karis fails to disclose displaying second window including a table of statistical measures for a selected parameter description produced from analysis of time-tagged data in the first window. The Action states that Karis does already graph such data, but that the display of the data is not in a table format. According to the Action, it is inherent in Karis that this data exists, because a graph from the data is drawn. Rothschild is relied upon though for disclosing a window including a table of statistical measures for a selected parameter as Figure 10 of Rothschild is referenced. The Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Karis with the teachings of Rothschild to include a table for the selected parameter with the motivation to provide a user with a more detailed description about that selected parameter.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to better clarify the present subject matter. In particular, element (a) of claim 18 now recites that analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines of different types associated with the mail or paper processing system for producing parameter values of the mail or paper processing system comprises (i) reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items, the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the

Serial No.: 10/055,604

log file, and (ii) parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to an event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. In addition to the distinctions noted with respect to Karis in previous amendments, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines wherein the analysis comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the log file. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to an event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. Rather, as stated above, Karis discloses a printing press monitoring system with a number of sensors where the system can monitor, analyze, and advise an operator as to various operations of the printing press. The addition of the teaching of Rothschild with the teachings of Karis fails to overcome the significant shortcomings of Karis. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 18, and dependent claim 19, based upon a combination of Karis and Rothschild should now be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Regarding claim 36, the Action states that Karis teaches all of the limitations of claim 34. Further, the Action states that Karis teaches a method comprising displaying a graph of measured values for the selected parameter description as the Action references Figure 15 of Karis. The Action acknowledges that Karis teaches graphing the data, but does not display the data in table format. Further, the Action states that it

Serial No.: 10/055,604

is inherent in Karis that this data exists, because a graph from the data is drawn. The Action also states that Rothschild teaches a window including a table of statistical measures for a selected parameter at Figure 10. Finally, the Action contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Karis with the teachings of Rothschild and include a table for the selected parameter with the motivation to provide the user with more detailed information about the selected parameter.

Claim 36 depends from claim 33. As set forth above, Karis does not teach the claim 33 features of analyzing time-tagged data associated with the plurality of machines of different types associated with the mail or paper processing system for producing parameter values of the mail or paper processing system comprises (i) reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, wherein the reading includes accessing a log file containing the time-tagged data items, the time-tagged data items associated with an event of interest for a particular machine spanning multiple, separated entries in the log file, and (ii) parsing the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to at least one event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or paper processing system. Further, Karis does not suggest these features of claim 33. The addition of the teaching of Rothschild with the teachings of Karis fails to overcome the significant shortcomings of Karis. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of dependent claim 36 based upon a combination of Karis and Rothschild should now be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.


Fee Due

A check in the amount of \$790.00 is enclosed for the fee due. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies of payment associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. 50-0426 to avoid the unintentional abandonment of the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A.

Date: June 6, 2006

By: 
Jeffrey L. Wilson
Registration No. 36,058
Customer No: 25297

1174/81/4 DIV